

Paper ID: 1092

Theme 5. Environmental issues related to grassland

Sub-theme 5.1. Climate change and grassland management

Methane emission estimated from different cattle intake data in heifers grazing a tropical pasture

José Augusto Imaz¹, O. Hernández¹, D. Dos Santos², A. Radrizzani¹, J. I. Arroquy³¹Instituto de Investigación Animal para el Chaco Semiárido (IIACS), Leales, Argentina²Instituto de Biodiversidad Neotropical (IBN), CONICET-UNT, San Miguel de Tucumán, Argentina³Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA), Santiago del Estero, Argentina**Keywords:** Data, Methane intake, Pasture

Introduction

The quantification of methane (CH₄) from enteric fermentation related to cattle diet is a useful tool to identify strategies to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. This is even important in tropical and subtropical regions due to the lack of CH₄ estimations in beef cattle, particularly from *Bos Indicus* breeds grazing tropical grasses (Kurihara *et al.*, 1999). Several modelling approaches have been developed in order to predict CH₄ emission. However, the use of these models has limitations associated with uncertainty information required such as feed intake (FI), composition of the selected diet and animal responses (Gonzalez *et al.*, 2014). FI is the main factor influencing CH₄ emission. Individual FI measurements are not easy to achieve accurately in grazing animals rather than those located in pens, particularly under deferred tropical pastures at the end of the dry season, due to the large proportion of death forage. In this case, cattle supplementation with energetic and proteins concentrates, is a viable practice in order to improve animal FI and reduce CH₄ emissions. The main objectives of this study was estimate and compare CH₄ emission using data collected from experimental trials and predicted by a model (UNFCCC, 2014) in supplemented heifers grazing low quality *Chloris gayana* pasture in northwestern Argentina (Semi-arid Chaco Region).

Materials and Methods

Data set: Twenty eight braford heifers grazing *Chloris gayana* (Rhodes grass) were subjected to supplementation treatments based on corn (70%) and soybean expeller (30%) at 1.3% liveweight -LW- for two grazing cycles (GP) of 21 days (collected data) during winter 2013 (Period 1[GP1]: June; Period 2[GP2]: August). Each period had 4 replicates with 7 animals (n=28). FI (kg dry matter -DM- animal day⁻¹) was determined from fecal output and diet digestibility -DMD-. Fecal collection was made for 7 days of each period on selected animals grazing individual subplots. Diet digestibility was estimated using the acid detergent insoluble ash (ADIA) as internal marker. Simultaneously, initial and final forage availability and plant fractions (leaf, stem, and dead material) were measured above and below the grazing level (17 cm). Forage digestibility and crude protein concentration (CP) was determined at each grazing layer. Deferred forage quality decreased (p<0.01) as dry season progresses (P2 = late dry season). Chemical composition of forage had the following values: 74 – 64 g Kg⁻¹ CP, 330 – 347 g Kg⁻¹ NDF and 701 - 677 g Kg⁻¹ ADF for June (P1, pre-deferred forage) and August (P2, deferred forage), respectively.

Data from model: Methane emissions were estimated for each individual animal with the methodology used by the Commonwealth of Australia (2014) for the Australian Greenhouse Gas Accounts as submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 2014). This methodology uses the equation from Minson and McDonald *¹ (1987) to predict daily FI (kg DM / animal. day). The methane emissions were calculated by using the equation reported by Kurihara (1999) and corrected by Hunter (2007) for tropical cattle*².

*¹. $FI = (1.185 + 0.00454 \times LW - 0.0000026 \times LW^2 + 0.315 \times LWC)^2 \times MA$.

*². $CH_4 = [kgCH_4 / animal. day = 34.9 \times FI - 30.8 / 1000]$.

Data were analyzed using linear mixed models, with the statistical software INFOSAT (Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina) with its interface with R. Differences between means were tested using LSD Fisher (P< 0.05).

Results and Discussion

Feed intake obtained by experimental data and predicted by model was not different in GP1. On the contrary, significant differences were observed in GP2 although FI data obtained by both data sources showed a lower variability than animal performance (Table 1). Predicted FI was only 6% higher than observed FI in GP2 and 2% lower in GP1. Consistently, González *et al.*, (2014) have shown that frequently collected LW data (daily) provide more accurate time estimations than intermittent measurements. Methane emission expressed by CH₄ kg ADG⁻¹ (intensity) was not different between observed and predicted data in both cycles, probably due to the intraespecific variation between animals in terms of growth, but also

we observed a CH₄ increment in GP2 (forage completely death, see experimental details) when heifers achieved less growth than GP1. Emission expressed in CH₄ (g an day⁻¹) were 1% and 8% higher using predicted FI data for the GP1 and GP2, respectively. In the same way, emission expressed in CH₄ (g kg DMI⁻¹) showed less variation (<2%) in both grazing cycles. Although the low data variability, significant differences were found in GP2 for both CH₄ expressions, this fact shows the influence of FI data on methane emission estimations. The proportion of gross energy intake yielded as CH₄ (Y) was predicted accurately by both predicted and observed FI data sets. No differences were observed in GP1 unlike the GP2.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for cattle measurements (LW, DMD and ADG), intake and methane emissions predicted by feed intake (FI) data set from an experimental trial and a model.

Variable	Grazing cycle 1			Grazing cycle 2		
	Mean	s.d.	CV (%)	Mean	s.d.	CV (%)
Initial weight (kg)	206,30	10,47	5,07	233,36	12,65	5,42
DMD (g Kg DM ⁻¹)	683,50	64,50	9,40	580,22	6,67	11,33
ADG (g day ⁻¹)	690,00	300,40	44,23	550,50	210,00	38,55
Intake (kg an day ⁻¹)						
Observed	5,04 a	0,36	7,07	4,98 b	0,44	8,93
Predicted	5,09 a	0,54	10,57	5,33 a	0,47	8,72
Intake (% LW)						
Observed	2,35	0,18	7,10	2,05	0,18	8,73
Predicted	2,37	0,23	10,37	2,19	0,19	8,20
Y						
Observed	6,35 a	0,17	2,75	6,56 a	0,09	1,42
Predicted	6,32 a	0,26	4,78	6,47 b	0,10	1,49
CH ₄ (g an day ⁻¹)						
Observed	145,22 a	12,47	8,57	142,91 b	15,51	10,85
Predicted	146,96 a	18,47	12,78	155,36 a	16,22	10,45
CH ₄ (g kg DMI ⁻¹)						
Observed	28,76 a	0,44	1,53	28,66 b	0,55	1,92
Predicted	28,78 a	0,69	2,39	29,08 a	0,52	1,80
CH ₄ (g kg ADG ⁻¹)						
Observed	258,19 a	172,64	66,87	284,41 a	118,93	41,82
Predicted	249,17 a	132,47	53,16	303,38 a	97,67	32,19

Conclusion

Utilizing the UNFCCC model provides accurate methane estimation based on LW and ADG data in these experimental conditions. However, feed intake variations (especially during dry season) captured by experimental trials have strong influence on methane estimations, and was not always reflected by intermittent collected cattle LW data.

References

- Commonwealth of Australia. 2014. National inventory report 2012. Vol. 1. Available at <http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/6b894230-f15f-4a69-a50c5577fecc8bc2/files/national-inventory-report2012-vol1.pdf>.
- González, L. A., E. Charmley and B. K. Henry. 2014. Modelling methane emissions from remotely collected live weight data and faecal near-infrared spectroscopy in beef cattle. *Animal Production Science* 54 (12):1980-1987.
- Hunter, R. A. 2007. Methane production by cattle in the tropics. *The British Journal of Nutrition* 98: 657.
- Kurihara, M., T. Magner, R. A. Hunter and G. J. McCrab. 1999. Methane production and energy partition of cattle in the tropics. *The British Journal of Nutrition* 81: 227-234.